UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,584	04/08/2004	Stephen Hart	20040117.ORI	6640
	7590 02/11/200 ERSEREAU, P.A.	EXAMINER		
900 SECOND A	AVENUE SOUTH		EPPS FORD, JANET L	
SUITE 820 MINNEAPOLI	S, MN 55402		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1633	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/824,584	HART ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Janet L. Epps-Ford	1633	

	danet E. Eppo i ora	1000				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATI	ION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWA	ANCE.				
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing data	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee inally set in the final Office action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any externation Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water MAMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a				
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I They raise new issues that would require further col 	nsideration and/or search (see NO					
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or 	·	ducing or simplifying the issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	,	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324)				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		impliant / monamont (1 102 021).				
	. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1.2.5.6.9-11.17-26.31-33.40 and 41.		ll be entered and an explanation of				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>3-4, and 39</u> .						
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>						
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
	/Janet L. Epps-Ford/					
	Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1633					

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant's amendment would potentially raise new prior art issues, now that the claims read on an in vitro method. Moreover, Applicant's amendment which limits the scope of the claims to wherein the nucleic acid binding portion is joined to the expression repressor protein, either directly or indirectly, by an intermediate linker or moiety, requires further consdieration, and potentially raises a new ground of rejection.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: 6. Since Applicant's amendment filed 1/10/2008 was not entered, Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of the instant claims for lack of enablement under 35 USC 112, 1st, which appear to be directed to the claims as amended are moot. Moreover, in regards to the rejection of the instant claims for lack of written description under 35 USC § 112, 1st, Applicants assert that the ordinary skilled artisan would clearly understand how to identify, design and/or synthesize suitable portions capable of suppressing expression of the selected gene, as required by the claims. Contrary to Applicant's assertions, as stated in the prior Office Action, Due to the significant breadth of the instant claims, and the limited guidance provided in the specification as filed and in the prior art, in regards to describing the structures of the full scope of compounds encompassed by the instant claims, the skilled artisan would have to resort to further experimentation in order to identify the full scope of compounds encompassed by the instant claims. See MPEP § 2163, which states "[A] biomolecule sequence described only by a functional characteristic, without any known or disclosed correlation between that function and the structure of the sequence, normally is not a sufficient identifying characteristic for written description purposes, even when accompanied by a method of obtaining the claimed sequence."